

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were previously pending in the subject application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-21. In an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 7, and 11-16, and has cancelled claims 17-21, without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are now pending in the subject application. Support for the amendments can be found at, for example, Figures 3-4 and paragraph nos. 20, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 41 of the subject application. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner has rejected claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of claims 11-16. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, Applicant has amended these claims to recite a “computer-readable *storage* medium, comprising executable instructions.” In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by DAGRACA (U.S. Patent No. 6,646,676). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of claims 1-16. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the subject application, Applicant has amended some of the claims to further distinguish over the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites: (1) defining “a target region included as a *portion* in each of a plurality of video frames, said target region representing a specific area to be monitored for movement;” and (2) coordinating “*selective storage* of said *portions* of said plurality of video frames *corresponding to said target region*.” Applicant’s review of DAGRACA did not identify any teaching directed to the defining and coordinating features recited in claim 1. DAGRACA discloses storing video signals in response to detecting security events. However, DAGRACA fails to show or suggest defining a target region included as a “portion” in each of a plurality of video frames and coordinating “selective storage” of the “portions … corresponding to said

target region," as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-10 are in a condition for allowance.

Claim 11 recites shifting "said target region as included in a second video frame in response to said detected movement, said target region being shifted *without repositioning an image acquisition device.*" Applicant's review of DAGRACA did not identify any teaching directed to the shifting feature recited in claim 11. DAGRACA discloses adjusting the positions of cameras to track a security event. However, DAGRACA's adjusting of cameras in no way shows or suggests shifting a target region as included in a video frame "without repositioning an image acquisition device," as recited in claim 11. For at least these reasons, claim 11 and its dependent claims 12-16 are in a condition for allowance.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in a condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if there are any residual issues that can be resolved through a telephone call.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1283.

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

Dated: June 26, 2007

By:



Cliff Z. Liu
Reg. No. 50,834

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5625
Fax: (650) 857-0663